



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/211,527	12/14/98	COX	D 5577-108

020792 WM51/1107
MYERS BIGEL SIBLEY & SAJOVEC
PO BOX 37428
RALEIGH NC 27627

EXAMINER

BACKER, F

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2155

DATE MAILED:

11/07/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/211,527

Applicant(s)

COX ET AL.

Examiner

Firmin Backer

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 December 1998.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been:
1. ☐ received.
2. ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code / Serial Number) _____.
3. ☐ received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. & 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This is in response to a letter for patent filed on December 14th, 1998 in which claims 1-42 are presented for examination. Claims 1-42 are pending in the letter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Norstedt (U.S. Patent No. 4,586,134) in view of Russell et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,553,242).

3. As per claim 1, 15, Norstedt teaches a method/system/program/system of controlling (communication controller, 2) a user session (user session) in a network comprising defining rules (defining communication rules) for controlling user sessions based on the characteristics of an operating environment (see abstract, fig 1, 6, 8, column 5 lines 34-65, claim 8), applying the defined rules to the determined characteristics to control the user session based on the characteristics on an instance of an operating environment (see abstract, column 5 lines 34-65, 13 lines 23-47, and claim 8). Norstedt fail to teach determining the characteristics of an instance of an operating environment associated with a user session in the network. However, Russell et al

Art Unit: 2155

teach determining the characteristics of an instance of an operating environment (server) associated with a user session in the network (see abstract, fig 1-3, column 3 lines 33-65, 6 lines 37-49, 8 lines 30-51). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Norstedt's method/system/program to include Russell et al's method/system/program of determining the characteristics of an instance of an operating environment associated with a user session in the network because this would have helped avoiding potential security problem in that all application/operating system accessed is controlled so that false accessed would not penetrate security system.

4. As per claim 2, 16, 30, Russell et al teach a method/system/program comprises determining type of network connection and type of device connected and a user ID and an application identification (see abstract, fig 1-3, 6 lines 37-8 line 3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Norstedt's method/system/program to include Russell et al's method/system/program because this would have ensure the correct connection is made to the network thereby avoiding potential security problem in that all application/operating system accessed is controlled so that false accessed would not penetrate security system.

5. As per claim 3, 17, 31, Norstedt teaches a method/system/program comprises defining rules which control content of communication provided to the user during session (see abstract, column 5 lines 34-65, 13 lines 23-47, and claim 8).

Art Unit: 2155

6. As per claim 4, 18, 32, Norstedt teaches a method/system/program wherein the rules comprises rules which control the characteristics of a network connection, content user by the user and preferences (see abstract, column 5 lines 34-65, 13 lines 23-47, and claim 8).

7. As per claim 5, 19, 33, Russell et al teach a method/system/program wherein the content controlled by the rules is controlled based type of network connection and type of device connected and a user ID and an application identification (see abstract, fig 1-3, column 6 lines 33-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Norstedt's method/system/program to include Russell et al's method/system/program because this would have ensure the correct connection is made to the network thereby avoiding potential security problem in that all application/operating system accessed is controlled so that false accessed would not penetrate security system.

8. As per claim 6, 20, 34, Norstedt teaches a method/system/program comprises defining rules which control access to application and network based on the characteristics on the operating environment (see column 3 lines 25-37, 6 lines 33-55).

9. As per claim 7, 8, 21, 22, 35, 36, Norstedt teaches a method/system/program comprise storing the defined rules and obtaining the defined rules from the network device (server) in response to the determination of characteristics of an operating environment associated with a user session (see abstract, column 6 lines 11-32, 10 lines 34-54).

10. As per claim 9, 23, 37, Norstedt teaches a method/system/program for controlling content provided to a device of a user of a network comprising modifying the content provided by the network device to the device based on the policies and the provided session dependent information (see abstract, fig 1, 6, 8, column 5 lines 34-65, claim 8). However, Norstedt fails to teach providing session dependent information associated with the device to the network device having stored policies which are based on the session dependent information. Russell et al teach a method/system/program providing session dependent information associated with the device to the network device having stored policies which are based on the session dependent information (see abstract, fig 1-3, column 3 lines 33-65). Therefore, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Norstedt's inventive concept to include Russell et al's method/system/program providing session dependent information associated with the device to the network device having stored policies which are based on the session dependent information because this would have helped avoiding potential security problem in that all application/operating system accessed is controlled so that false accessed would not penetrate security system.

11. As per claim 10, 24, 38, Norstedt teaches a method/system/program comprises automatically translating content of a communication provided to the device (see abstract, column 3 lines 6-36, 13 lines 23-47, and claim 8).

12. As per claim 11, 25, 39, Russell et al teach a method/system/program wherein type of network connection and type of device connected and a user ID and an application identification

Art Unit: 2155

(see abstract, fig 1-3, 6 lines 37-8 line 3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Norstedt's method/system/program to include Russell et al's method/system/program because this would have ensure the correct connection is made to the network thereby avoiding potential security problem in that all application/operating system accessed is controlled so that false accessed would not penetrate security system.

13. As per claim 12, 26, 40, Norstedt teaches a method/system/program wherein the policies comprises policies which control the characteristics of a network connection, content user by the user and preferences (see abstract, column 5 lines 34-65, 13 lines 23-47, and claim 8).

14. As per claim 13, 27, 41, Russell et al teach a method/system/program wherein type of network connection and type of device connected and a user ID and an application identification (see abstract, fig 1-3, column 6 lines 33-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Norstedt's method/system/program to include Russell et al's method/system/program because this would have ensure the correct connection is made to the network thereby avoiding potential security problem in that all application/operating system accessed is controlled so that false accessed would not penetrate security system.

Art Unit: 2155

15. As per claim 14, 28, 42, Norstedt teaches a method/system/program further comprising controlling access to an application and the network use policies based on the session (see abstract, column 5 lines 34-65, 13 lines 23-47, and claim 8).


Conclusion


16. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. (5,615,339).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Firmin Backer whose telephone number is 703-305-0624. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thu 8:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sheikh Ayaz can be reached on 703-305-9648. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-3718 for regular communications and 703-305-5352 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.


Firmin Backer
November 1, 2000


ARIO ETIENNE
PRIMARY EXAMINER